



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/048,119	06/10/2002	Reiner Gieck	449122022600	1678

25227 7590 01/19/2006

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

AGHDAM, FRESHTEH N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2631

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/048,119	GIECK, REINER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Freshteh N. Aghdam	2631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see page 5, filed 11/7/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-9 under Ejzak (US 6,389,066), in view of Zirwas (US 6,798,855) and Zhang et al (US 6,891,854) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Sweitzer et al (US 6,546,046) and Lepitre (US 5,914,993).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lepitre et al (US 5,914,993).

As to claim 1, Lepitre teaches determining and storing (i.e. rate defining means) at least one transmission method with at least one transmission speed (i.e. rate/ carrier) that represents a maximum data throughput rate for different line parameters of lines

Art Unit: 2631

(i.e. transfer function of the line and signal to noise ratios of the line); measuring the line parameters of the line using the at least one transmission method (Col. 1, Lines 35-57; Col. 2, Lines 37-65); and selecting the at least one transmission method having the transmission speed (i.e. rate) in which the measured and stored line parameters are most compatible (Col. 1, Lines 35-57; Col. 2, Lines 37-65; Tables 1-2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lepitre et al, and further in view of Sweitzer et al (US 6,546,046).

As to claim 2, Lepitre teaches all the subject matters claimed above, except for the line parameters are represented by the attenuation and running time of the line and by interference signals on the line. Sweitzer teaches the line parameters are represented by the attenuation and running time of the line and by interference signals on the line (Col. 6, Lines 26-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Sweitzer with Lepitre in order to negotiate a start up data rate by transmitting data rate messages based on the line quality measurements (Abstract).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lepitre et al and Sweitzer, further in view of Zirwas (US 6,798,855).

As to claim 3, Lepitre and Sweitzer teach all the subject matters claimed above, except for the running time being determined by a measurement of the phase difference between two signals with different frequencies. Zirwas, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a synchronization method, wherein the running time is determined by a measurement of the phase difference between two signals (Col. 7, Lines 30-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Zirwas with Lepitre and Sweitzer in order to synchronize two carrier signals (Abstract).

As to claim 4, Lepitre teaches the maximum data rate for different line parameters is determined with different transmission methods and transmission speeds, by selecting the transmission methods in the frequency range of which the line parameters demonstrate the least variations, and in which the interference of the measured interference signal has the least effect (Col. 1, Lines 35-56; Col. 2, Lines 37-65). Lepitre is silent about the line parameters are represented by the attenuation and running time of the line and by interference signals on the line, and the line parameters that represent the maximum throughput rate are stored in memory (Col. 1, Lines 35-43) rate defining means. Sweitzer teaches the line parameters are represented by the attenuation and running time of the line and by interference signals on the line (Col. 6, Lines 26-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

Art Unit: 2631

combine the teaching of Sweitzer with Lepitre in order to negotiate a start up data rate by transmitting data rate messages based on the line quality measurements (Abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As to claims 5-9, specification fails to describe as how measuring interference of the line is performed before the line parameters are measured at the central end since the line parameters are defined as attenuation and running time of the line and by interference signals on the line in claim 2.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Freshteh N. Aghdam whose telephone number is (571) 272-6037. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00-5:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2631

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Freshteh Aghdam
January 11, 2006


KEVIN BURD
PRIMARY EXAMINER